

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS
HOUSTON DIVISION

ERIK GARCIA,)
vs.)
Plaintiff,) CIVIL ACTION
BURGER KING COMPANY LLC, d/b/a)
BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC.,) Case No. 4:23-CV-02796
Defendants.)

COMPLAINT

COMES NOW, ERIK GARCIA, by and through the undersigned counsel, and files this, his Complaint against Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.* (“ADA”) and the ADA’s Accessibility Guidelines, 28 C.F.R. Part 36 (“ADAAG”). In support thereof, Plaintiff respectfully shows this Court as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This Court has original jurisdiction over the action pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331 and 1333 for Plaintiff’s claims pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*, based upon Defendants’ failure to remove physical barriers to access and violations of Title III of the ADA.

PARTIES

2. Plaintiff, ERIK GARCIA (hereinafter “Plaintiff”) is, and has been at all times relevant to the instant matter, a natural person residing in Houston, Texas (Harris County).
3. Plaintiff is disabled as defined by the ADA.
4. Plaintiff is required to traverse in a wheelchair and is substantially limited in

performing one or more major life activities, including but not limited to: walking and standing.

5. Plaintiff uses a wheelchair for mobility purposes.

6. Plaintiff is also an independent advocate of the rights of similarly situated disabled persons and is a “tester” for the purpose of enforcing Plaintiff’s civil rights, monitoring, determining and ensuring whether places of public accommodation are in compliance with the ADA. His motivation to return to a location, in part, stems from a desire to utilize ADA litigation to make Plaintiff’s community more accessible for Plaintiff and others; and pledges to do whatever is necessary to create the requisite standing to confer jurisdiction upon this Court so an injunction can be issued correcting the numerous ADA violations on this property, including returning to the Property within six months after it is accessible (“Advocacy Purposes”).

7. Defendant, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC (hereinafter “BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC”), is a Florida limited liability company that transacts business in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

8. Defendant, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC, may be properly served with process for service via its registered agent, to wit: c/o C T CORPORATION, Registered Agent, 1999 Bryan Street, Suite 900, Dallas, TX 75201.

9. Defendant, HOUSTON FOODS, INC. (hereinafter “HOUSTON FOODS, INC.”) is a Texas company that transacts in the State of Texas and within this judicial district.

10. Defendant, HOUSTON FOODS, INC., may be properly served with process for service via its registered agent, to wit: c/o CORPORATION SERVICE COMPANY, d/b/a CSC-LAWYERS INCO., Registered Agent, 211 E. 7th Street, Suite 620, Austin, TX 78701.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

11. On or about March 27, 2023, Plaintiff was a customer at “Burger King” a business located at 9603 Bissonnet Blvd., Houston, TX 77036, referenced herein as “Burger King”. Attached is a receipt documenting Plaintiff’s purchase. *See Exhibit 1.* Also attached is a photograph documenting Plaintiff’s visit to the Property. *See Exhibit 2.*

12. Plaintiff lives 2 miles from the Property.

13. Given the close vicinity of the Property to the Plaintiff’s residence and due to the fact the Property is directly adjacent to a main highway, Plaintiff routinely drives by the Property.

14. Defendant, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC, is the owner or co-owner of the real property and improvements that Burger King is situated upon and that is the subject of this action, referenced herein as the “Property.”

15. Defendant, HOUSTON FOODS, INC., is the lessee or sub-lessee of the real property and improvements that are the subject of this action.

16. Plaintiff’s access to the business(es) located 9603 Bissonnet Blvd., Houston, TX 77036, Harris County Property Appraiser’s account number 0770370010002 (“the Property”), and/or full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, foods, drinks, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein were denied and/or limited because of his disabilities, and he will be denied and/or limited in the future unless and until Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., are compelled to remove the physical barriers to access and correct the ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those set forth in this Complaint.

17. Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC, DBA BKCO LLC, and

HOUSTON FOODS, INC., are responsible for complying with the ADA for both the exterior portions and interior portions of the Property. Even if there is a lease between Defendant, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC, DBA BKCO LLC, and the tenant allocating responsibilities for ADA compliance within the unit the tenant operates, that lease is only between the property owner and the tenant and does not abrogate the Defendant's requirement to comply with the ADA for the entire Property it owns, including the interior portions of the Property which are public accommodations. *See* 28 CFR § 36.201(b).

18. Plaintiff has visited the Property twice before as a customer and advocate for the disabled. Plaintiff intends to revisit the Property within six months after the barriers to access detailed in this Complaint are removed and the Property is accessible again. The purpose of the revisit is to be a return customer, to determine if and when the Property is made accessible and to maintain standing for this lawsuit for Advocacy Purposes.

19. Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property to purchase goods and/or services as a return customer living in the near vicinity as well as for Advocacy Purposes but does not intend to re-expose himself to the ongoing barriers to access and engage in a futile gesture of visiting the public accommodation known to Plaintiff to have numerous and continuing barriers to access.

20. Plaintiff travelled to the Property as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, personally encountered many barriers to access the Property that are detailed in this Complaint, engaged many barriers, suffered legal harm and legal injury, and will continue to suffer such harm and injury if all the illegal barriers to access present at the Property identified in this Complaint are not removed.

21. Although Plaintiff may not have personally encountered each and every barrier to access identified in Plaintiff's Complaint, Plaintiff became aware of all identified barriers prior to filing the Complaint and because Plaintiff intends on revisiting the Property as a customer and advocate for the disabled within six months or sooner after the barriers to access are removed, it is likely that despite not actually encountering a particular barrier to access on one visit, Plaintiff may encounter a different barrier to access identified in the complaint in a subsequent visit as, for example, one accessible parking space may not be available and he would need to use an alternative accessible parking space in the future on his subsequent visit. As such, all barriers to access identified in the Complaint must be removed in order to ensure Plaintiff will not be exposed to barriers to access and legally protected injury.

22. Plaintiff's inability to fully access the Property and the stores within in a safe manner and in a manner which inhibits the free and equal enjoyment of the goods and services offered at the Property, both now and into the foreseeable future, constitutes an injury in fact as recognized by Congress and is historically viewed by Federal Courts as an injury in fact.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE ADA AND ADAAG

23. On July 26, 1990, Congress enacted the Americans with Disabilities Act 42 U.S.C. § 12101 *et seq.*

24. Congress found, among other things, that:

- (i) some 43,000,000 Americans have one or more physical or mental disabilities, and this number is increasing as the population as a whole is growing older;
- (ii) historically, society has tended to isolate and segregate individuals with disabilities, and, despite some improvements, such forms of discrimination against individuals with disabilities continue to be a serious and pervasive social problem;

- (iii) discrimination against individuals with disabilities persists in such critical areas as employment, housing public accommodations, education, transportation, communication, recreation, institutionalization, health services, voting, and access to public services;
- (iv) individuals with disabilities continually encounter various forms of discrimination, including outright intentional exclusion, the discriminatory effects of architectural, transportation, and communication barriers, overprotective rules and policies, failure to make modifications to existing facilities and practices, exclusionary qualification standards and criteria, segregation, and relegation to lesser service, programs, activities, benefits, jobs, or other opportunities; and
- (v) the continuing existence of unfair and unnecessary discrimination and prejudice denies people with disabilities the opportunity to compete on an equal basis and to pursue those opportunities for which our free society is justifiably famous, and costs the United States billions of dollars in unnecessary expenses resulting from dependency and non-productivity.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(a)(1) - (3), (5) and (9).

25. Congress explicitly stated that the purpose of the ADA was to:
- (i) provide a clear and comprehensive national mandate for the elimination of discrimination against individuals with disabilities;
 - (ii) provide a clear, strong, consistent, enforceable standards addressing discrimination against individuals with disabilities; and
- * * * * *
- (iv) invoke the sweep of congressional authority, including the power to enforce the fourteenth amendment and to regulate commerce, in order to address the major areas of discrimination faced day-to-day by people with disabilities.

42 U.S.C. § 12101(b)(1)(2) and (4).

26. The congressional legislation provided places of public accommodation one and a half years from the enactment of the ADA to implement its requirements.

27. The effective date of Title III of the ADA was January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C.

§ 12181; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

28. The Property is a public accommodation and service establishment.

29. Pursuant to the mandates of 42 U.S.C. § 12134(a), on July 26, 1991, the Department of Justice and Office of Attorney General promulgated federal regulations to implement the requirements of the ADA. 28 C.F.R. Part 36.

30. Public accommodations were required to conform to these regulations by January 26, 1992 (or by January 26, 1993 if a defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). 42 U.S.C. § 12181 *et seq.*; 28 C.F.R. § 36.508(a).

31. The Property must be, but is not, in compliance with the ADA and ADAAG.

32. The Property is comprised of multiple buildings served by a single parking lot. All of the buildings on the Property are public accommodations.

33. Plaintiff has attempted to, and has to the extent possible, accessed the Property in his capacity as a customer at the Property as well as an independent advocate for the disabled, but could not fully do so because of his disabilities resulting from the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

34. Plaintiff intends to visit the Property again in the very near future as a customer and as an independent advocate for the disabled, in order to utilize all of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations commonly offered at the Property, but will be unable to fully do so because of his disability and the physical barriers to access, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property that preclude and/or limit his

access to the Property and/or the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations offered therein, including those barriers, conditions and ADA violations more specifically set forth in this Complaint.

35. Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., have discriminated against Plaintiff (and others with disabilities) by denying his access to, and full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Property, as prohibited by, and by failing to remove architectural barriers as required by, 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv).

36. Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., will continue to discriminate against Plaintiff and others with disabilities unless and until Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., are compelled to remove all physical barriers that exist at the Property, including those specifically set forth herein, and make the Property accessible to and usable by Plaintiff and other persons with disabilities.

37. A specific list of unlawful physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations which Plaintiff experienced and/or observed, or was made aware of prior to the filing of this Complaint, that precluded and/or limited Plaintiff's access to the Property and the full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and accommodations of the Property include, but are not limited to:

ACCESSIBLE ELEMENTS:

- (i) There are two accessible parking spaces that are missing identification signs in violation of Section 502.6 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space.

- (ii) The access aisle to the two accessible parking spaces is not level due to the presence of an accessible ramp in the access aisle in violation of Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.
- (iii) The accessible curb ramp is improperly protruding into the access aisle of the accessible parking spaces in violation of Section 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the lift from the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface.
- (iv) The accessible parking spaces are not level due to the presence of accessible ramp side flares in the accessible parking space in violation of Sections 502.4 and 406.5 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property as the van may rest upon the ramp and create an unlevel surface for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle.
- (v) Due to an inadequate policy of parking lot maintenance or a lack thereof, the two accessible parking spaces are not adequately marked so as to adequately gauge the width of accessible parking spaces and the presence of an access aisle and is therefore in violation of Sections 502.1 and 502.2 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to locate an accessible parking space and may cause other vehicles to unknowingly park in the accessible parking space decreasing the available width to Plaintiff.

- (vi) The ground surfaces of the two accessible space have vertical rises in excess of ¼ (one quarter) inch in height, are not stable or slip resistant, have broken or unstable surfaces or otherwise fail to comply with Sections 502.4, 302 and 303 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property.
- (vii) The access aisle serving the single accessible parking space has a width that decreases below 60 inches and is therefore in violation of Section 502.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it dangerous and difficult for Plaintiff to exit and enter their vehicle while parked at the Property.
- (viii) The single accessible parking space is not located on the shortest distance to the accessible route leading to the accessible entrances in violation of Section 208.3.1 of the 2010 ADAAG Standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult and dangerous for Plaintiff to access the units of the Property from these accessible parking spaces as the far location increases the likelihood of traversing into the vehicular way and getting struck by a vehicle or encountering a barrier to access which stops Plaintiff from accessing the public accommodations offered at the Property.
- (ix) Due to the presence of stairs, the Property lacks an accessible route from the sidewalk to the accessible entrance in violation of Section 206.2.1 of the 2010 ADAAG standards. This barrier to access would make it difficult for Plaintiff to utilize public transportation to access the public accommodations located on the Property.

(x) Defendants fail to adhere to a policy, practice and procedure to ensure that all facilities are readily accessible to and usable by disabled individuals.

38. The violations enumerated above may not be a complete list of the barriers, conditions or violations encountered by Plaintiff and/or which exist at the Property.

39. Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Property in order to determine all of the discriminatory conditions present at the Property in violation of the ADA.

40. The removal of the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations alleged herein is readily achievable and can be accomplished and carried out without significant difficulty or expense. 42 U.S.C. § 12182(b)(2)(A)(iv); 42 U.S.C. § 12181(9); 28 C.F.R. § 36.304.

41. All of the violations alleged herein are readily achievable to modify to the Property into compliance with the ADA.

42. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because the nature and cost of the modifications are relatively low.

43. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable because Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., have the financial resources to make the necessary modifications. According to the Property Appraiser, the Appraised value of the Property is \$1,058,320.00.

44. Upon information and good faith belief, the removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is readily achievable.

45. The removal of the physical barriers and dangerous conditions present at the Property is also readily achievable because Defendants have available to it a \$5,000.00 tax credit

and up to a \$15,000.00 tax deduction from the IRS for spending money on accessibility modifications.

46. Upon information and good faith belief, the Property has been altered since 2010.

47. In instances where the 2010 ADAAG standards do not apply, the 1991 ADAAG standards apply, and all of the alleged violations set forth herein can be modified to comply with the 1991 ADAAG standards.

48. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, is suffering irreparable harm, and reasonably anticipates that he will continue to suffer irreparable harm unless and until Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., are required to remove the physical barriers, dangerous conditions and ADA violations that exist at the Property, including those alleged herein.

49. Plaintiff's requested relief serves the public interest.

50. The benefit to Plaintiff and the public of the relief outweighs any resulting detriment to Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC.

51. Plaintiff's counsel is entitled to recover its reasonable attorney's fees and costs of litigation from Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., pursuant to 42 U.S.C. §§ 12188 and 12205.

52. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a), this Court is provided authority to grant injunctive relief to Plaintiff, including the issuance of an Order directing Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., to modify the Property to the extent required by the ADA.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays as follows:

- (a) That the Court find Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., in violation of the ADA and ADAAG;
- (b) That the Court issue a permanent injunction enjoining Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., from continuing their discriminatory practices;
- (c) That the Court issue an Order requiring Defendants, BURGER KING COMPANY LLC DBA BKCO LLC and HOUSTON FOODS, INC., to (i) remove the physical barriers to access and (ii) alter the Property to make it readily accessible to and useable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA;
- (d) That the Court award Plaintiff his reasonable attorneys' fees, litigation expenses and costs; and
- (e) That the Court grant such further relief as deemed just and equitable in light of the circumstances.

Dated: July 30, 2023.

Respectfully submitted,

/s/ Douglas S. Schapiro
Douglas S. Schapiro, Esq.
Southern District of Texas ID No. 3182479
The Schapiro Law Group, P.L.
7301-A W. Palmetto Park Rd., #100A
Boca Raton, FL 33433
Tel: (561) 807-7388
Email: schapiro@schapirolawgroup.com